A M

When we die, we shall find that we have not lost our dreams; but that we have only lost our sleep. —RICHTER

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXXV August, 1947 No. 10

A LANGUAGE OF CONSCIOUSNESS

THE Theosophical Movement is a philosophical undertaking, for it assigns primary reality to inner progress—progress within the nature of man. The aims of that Movement do not change with the passage of several generations, nor even centuries, for until human nature undergoes basic alteration, the problems of human life will be the same. Therefore, the social commentaries of H. P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge, for instance, serve as pertinently today as they did fifty or sixty years ago. It is not that these teachers were addressing themselves to the future, except in the sense that past, present and future are philosophically one. They were addressing *man,* to whom the "past" represents knowledge achieved, who in the "present" is concerned with applying principles now recognized, and for whom the "future" will involve understanding yet to be developed.

Civilizations, nations, communities, families, and even the circumstances of any one existence are only the props with which the *active reality,* soul, plays out the eternal drama of conscious evolution. To come on the stage and forget one's lines and role because the props look different—is the common human experience. Not only have we forgotten our past lives on earth, but we largely forget that we have forgotten. Within the compass of our lives from day to day, we are puzzled to explain how it is that we dream, and we are at a loss to account for the sleeping hours that are spent beyond the dreaming state. Only the philosopher and the mystic—those aliens in the literal

world of fact and "thing"—have a growing faith that every man can live interiorly, and that such a life should have more of benevolence, intelligence and usefulness than any other. But the mystic or philosopher is too often simply *one* man who has discovered an inner world; he cannot communicate his knowledge of it, having no appropriate language. In the West at least, there generally exist only the crudest means of referring to states of consciousness and of describing the inner planes of being.

A language of consciousness may not seem important for the mechanics of reform, but it is a first necessity in a *philosophy* of reform. Mass inertia in the face of injustice and oppression is a multiple of each man's reluctance to avail himself of opportunities for improvement. Of what is that resistance compounded? Pride, habit, lack of conviction or will power, mental laziness or blunted intuition? And which of these elements represent carry-overs from other lives, the obverse side of past karma? "Who toiled a slave may come anew a prince, for gentle worthiness and merit won. Who ruled a king may wander earth in rags, for things done and undone." Will either one be less himself for the alteration of robes and rags, and shall either slavedom or kingdom be taken as the prime object of reform?

General apathy or despair, plentifully bemoaned in our times, is—in any age—distilled privately, and its production cannot therefore be curtailed in the abstract. The lone despairer must know the law of diffusion of personal thinking before he can even consider that abstaining from inner dismay might be a social duty. The chain-reactions of hate, anger and fear explode rapidly into "action," but the apparently indecisive influence of doubt and discouragement is a negative force of comparable magnitude, which can not be overlooked. Unless such "forces of reaction" in the psychological realm are recognized and countered, the outer work of reform has but a stunted growth, if, indeed, it can make its way at all.

The world for every man is first the world within himself, the world of his *selves*. This is the world out of which he looks at the rest of life, and according to his situation in this inner world will be his experience "outside." Let all other men dwell together in peace, harmony and the highest creative endeavor—the man who has not achieved integration in his own nature can neither participate in nor

contribute to the general welfare. Integrity—the knowledge of one's whole being and the power to keep it whole—is not acquired by osmosis. Let other men be sunk in the blackest horrors and deepest tragedy: the man whose courage and strength have won the inner war will not betray the sufferers by adding weakness to their insufficiency. He may even find a way to restore their memory of the self-knowledge they must gain and conquer with.

The alien world of the body and circumstances may be a dismal tenement for the indwelling soul, or it may be a way-station on the path of inner progress. Which it shall be, depends neither on the body and circumstances nor the spirit-soul, but chiefly on the polarity of mind. This is the occasion for philosophy—that science which is ineluctably human, because it relates to the *complex* of human life, not merely to one or another of its constituent elements. Philosophy does not deal with events, but with events-and-the-man; it regards not the mind alone but the interaction between the mind and its instruments. Every focus for the mind imposes some restriction on its power; contrariwise, every restriction may be used to concentrate power. Thus the strongest prison for the mind is the *sense* of bitter confinement—a cramped darkness which the mind itself devises and maintains. On the other hand, given another polarity of mind, a veritable prison of circumstances and conditions may be transformed into precisely the lens necessary to Vision.

Philosophy, then, comprehends the laws of man's inward activity. Its vocabulary is in the language of consciousness; its study begins with the alphabet of the constituent principles of man—sometimes numbered as seven, and again characterized as the "forty-nine fires" of being. The Theosophical doctrine of the seven principles, though difficult, was not promulgated by Madame Blavatsky for academicians or "philosophicules," as she called them. It was given to *mankind,* which—in all its efforts toward universal brotherhood—struggles against an inner confusion that only philosophy can resolve. With a language of consciousness, as it is learned, the student can progressively understand his inner life, and come to direct it consciously toward a goal he believes in. This is to interpret the original Third Object—to study the "unexplained laws" of the psychical nature of man—for the sake of the First Object, human solidarity.

RELIGION AND REFORM FROM A THEOSOPHICAL VIEW-POINT

By WILLIAM Q. JUDGE, F.T.S.

[This article first appeared on March 12, 1891, in the *Twentieth Century,* a New York paper styled "a weekly radical magazine." Hugh O. Pentecost, the editor, was a so-called "materialist" who, as one critic declared, "practices happier things than he preaches." Mr. Judge's article drew similar complaints, for he, too, failed to preach "happier things." Two replies to "Religion and Reform," appearing later, repudiated with fervor the theory that a change in idea and philosophy must precede a social change. The second reply —written, incidentally, by a T.S. member—went so far as to reproach Mr. Judge for "prophetic anachronisms," and confidently asserted: "Society may, I think, fairly hope to escape the social Scylla and Charybdis pessimistically predicted by Mr. Judge." Unfortunately, however, the social disasters predicted in "Religion and Reform" are now, in this twentieth century, well on the way toward being realized. —Eds. THEOSOPHY.]

TWO great shadowy shapes remain fixed in the attention of the mind of the day, threatening to become in the twentieth century more formidable and engrossing than ever. They are religion and reform, and in their sweep they include every question of pressing human need; for the first arises through the introspective experience of the race out of its aspirations toward the unknown and the ever present desire to solve the questions whence and why? while the second has its birth in the conditions surrounding the bodies of the questioners of fate who struggle helplessly in the ocean of material existence.

Many men wielding small or weighty pens have wrestled with these questions, attacking them in ways as various as the minds of those who have taken them up for consideration, but it still remains for the theosophist to bring forward his views and obtain a hearing. This he should always do as a matter of duty, and not from the pride of fame or the self-assertion which would see itself proclaimed before men. For he knows that, even if he should not speak or could not get a hearing, the march of that evolution in which he thoroughly believes will force these views upon humanity, even if that has to be accomplished by suffering endured by every human unit.

The theosophist can see no possibility of reform in existing abuses, in politics or social relations, unless the plan of reform is one which grows out of a true religion, and he does not think that any of the prevailing religions of the Occident are true or adequate. They do not go to the root of the evil which causes the pain and sorrow that call for reform or alleviation. And in his opinion theosophy—the essence or concentrated virtue of every religion—alone has power to offer and effect the cure.

None of the present attempts at reform will meet success so long as they are devoid of the true doctrine as to man, his nature and destiny, and respecting the universe, its origin and future course. Every one of these essays leaves man where it finds him, neglecting the lessons to be drawn from the cycles in their never-ceasing revolution. While efforts are made to meliorate his mere physical condition, the real mover, the man within, is left without a guide, and is therefore certain to produce from no matter how good a system the same evils which are designed to be destroyed. At every change he once more proceeds to vitiate the effect of any new regimen by the very defects in human nature that cannot be reached by legislation or by dogmatic creeds and impossible hells, because they are beyond the reach of everything except the power of his own thought. Nationalism, Socialism, Liberalism, Conservatism, Communism, and Anarchism are each and all ineffective in the end. The beautiful dream depicted by Nationalism cannot be made a physical fact, since it has no binding inward sanction; Communism could not stand, because in time the Communist would react back into the holder of individual rights and protector of property which his human nature would demand ought not to be dissipated among others less worthy. And the continuance of the present system, in which the amasser of wealth is allowed to retain and dispose of what he has acquired, will, in the end, result in the very riot and bloodshed which legislation is meant to prevent and suppress.

Indeed, the great popular right of universal suffrage, instead of bringing about the true reign of liberty and law, will be the very engine through which the crash will come, unless with it the Theosophic doctrines are inculcated. We have seen the suffrage gradually extended so as to be universal in the United States, but the people

are used by the demagogues and the suffrage is put to waste. Meanwhile, the struggle between capital and labor grows more intense, and in time will rage with such fury that the poor and unlearned, feeling the gad of poverty strike deeper, will cast their votes for measures respecting property in land or chattels, so revolutionary that capital will combine to right the supposed invasion by sword and bullet. This is the end toward which it is all tending, and none of the reforms so sincerely put forward will avert it for one hour after the causes have been sufficiently fixed and crystallized. This final formation of the efficient causes is not yet complete, but is rapidly approaching the point where no cure will be possible.

The cold acquirements of science give us, it is true, magnificient physical results, but fail like creeds and reforms by legislative acts in the end. Using her own methods and instruments, she fails to find the soul and denies its existence; while the churches assert a soul but cannot explain it, and at the same time shock human reason by postulating the incineration by material fire of that which they admit is immortal. As a means of escape from this dilemma nothing is offered save a vicarious atonement and a retreat behind a blind acceptance of incongruities and injustice in a God who is supposed by all to be infinitely merciful and just.

Thus, on the one hand, science has no terrors and no reformatory force for the wicked and the selfish; on the other, the creeds, losing their hold in consequence of the inroads of knowledge, grow less and less useful and respected every year. The people seem to be approaching an era of wild unbelief. Just such a state of thought prevailed before the French revolution of 1793.

Theosophy here suggests the reconciliation of science and religion by showing that there is a common foundation for all religions and that the soul exists with all the psychic forces proceeding therefrom. As to the universe, Theosophy teaches a never-ending evolution and involution. Evolution begins when the Great Breath—Herbert Spencer's "Unknowable" which manifests as universal energy—goes forth, and involution, or the disappearance of the universe, obtains when the same breath returns to itself. This coming forth lasts millions upon millions of years, and involution prevails for an equal length of time. As soon as the breath goes forth, universal mind

together with universal basic matter appears. In the ancient system this mind is called *Mahat,* and matter *Prakriti.* Mahat has the plan of evolution which it impresses upon Prakriti, causing it to ceaselessly proceed with the evolution of forms and the perfecting of the units composing the cosmos. The crown of this perfection is man, and he contains in himself the whole plan of the universe copied in miniature but universally potential.

This brings us to ourselves, surrounded as we are by an environment that appears to us to cause pain and sorrow, no matter where we turn. But as the immutable laws of cause and effect brought about our own evolution, the same laws become our saviors from the miseries of existence. The two great laws postulated by Theosophy for the world's reform are those of Karma and Reincarnation. Karma is the law of action which decrees that man must suffer and enjoy solely through his own thoughts and acts. His thoughts, being the smaller copy of the universal mind, lie at the root of every act and constitute the force that brings about the particular body he may inhabit. So Reincarnation in an earthly body is as necessary for him as the ceaseless reincarnation of the universal mind in evolution after evolution is needful for it. And as no man is a unit separate from the others in the Cosmos, he must think and act in such a way that no discord is produced by him in the great universal stream of evolution. It is the disturbance of this harmony which alone brings on the miseries of life, whether that be of a single man or of the whole nation. As he has acted in his last life or lives, so will he be acted upon in succeeding ones. This is why the rich are often unworthy, and the worthy so frequently poor and afflicted. All appeals to force are useless, as they only create new causes sure to react upon us in future lives as well as in the present. But if all men believed in this just and comprehensive law of Karma, knowing well that whatever they do will be punished or rewarded in this or other new lives, the evils of existence would begin to disappear. The rich would know that they are only trustees for the wealth they have and are bound to use it for the good of their fellows, and the poor, satisfied that their lot is the just desert for prior acts and aided by the more fortunate, would work out old bad Karma and sow the seeds of only that which is good and harmonious.

National misery, such as that of Whitechapel in London (to be imitated ere long in New York), is the result of national Karma, which in its turn is composed of the aggregation of not only the Karma of the individuals concerned but also of that belonging to the rest of the nation. Ordinary reforms, whether by law or otherwise, will not compass the end in view. This is demonstrated by experience. But given that the ruling and richer classes believe in Karma and Reincarnation, a universal widespread effort would at once be made by those favorites of fortune toward not only present alleviation of miserable conditions, but also in the line of educating the vulgar who now consider themselves oppressed as well by their superiors as by fate. The opposite is now the case, for we cannot call individual sporadic or sectarian efforts of beneficence a national or universal attempt. Just now we have the General of the Salvation Army proposing a huge scheme of colonization which is denounced by a master of science, Prof. Huxley, as utopian, inefficient, and full of menace for the future. And he, in the course of his comment, candidly admits the great danger to be feared from the criminal and dissatisfied classes. But if the poorer and less discriminating see the richer and the learned offering physical assistance and intelligent explanations of the apparent injustice of life—which can be found only in Theosophy—there would soon arise a possibility of making effective the fine laws and regulations which many are ready to add to those already proposed. Without such Theosophic philosophy and religion, the constantly increasing concessions made to the clamor of the uneducated democracy's demands will only end in inflating the actual majority with an undue sense of their real power, and thus precipitate the convulsion which might be averted by the other course.

This is a general statement of the only panacea, for if once believed in—even from a selfish motive—it will compel, by a force that works from within all men, the endeavor to escape from future unhappiness which is inevitable if they violate the laws inhering in the universal mind.

STUDIES IN KARMA

II: The Kshatriya's Dharma

WORLD War II was waged with a variety of motives, depending upon the ideals of the individuals and groups participating. Many men poured their energies into the crucible of destruction, with a sincere desire to sacrifice both wealth and blood for the relief of the victims of brutal tyranny. Conscientious men worked for intervention in Ethiopia, China, and fought for the Spanish loyalists, when there was no immediate threat to their own country. Few believed that war is a good means, or that it is, in itself, anything but evil, yet many were convinced of the necessity for military violence because they conceived it to be the lesser of two evils—not merely for themselves, but for humanity at large. Such thinking comprised the idealism of World War II, and had there been more of it, the "peace" would perforce be a better peace. Yet it is necessary to note that the vast majority did not fight this war because they wanted to save oppressed people elsewhere. The vast majority did not volunteer for service in *any* army, even that of Japan or that of Germany—whose peoples are often called "naturally bloodthirsty." The majority went to war because they were told that the self-interest of their nation was threatened, and because they accepted conscription for military service in the name of national emergency—and because they were ordered to. When Germany first entered upon her program of intensified militarization, Adolf Hitler had but recently risen to power, campaigning, paradoxically, on an "I will keep you out of war" platform. A large army was urged upon the somewhat hesitant general German population as a means of avoiding war. But the determining factor in the militarizing process was not conviction of its need, but the concentration of power in a centralized state which it had become extremely dangerous to oppose.

The pattern is familiar. All over the world, the "common man" has for years been ordered to conform to "military necessity" in the name of national self-interest. In some lands, opposition to this requirement is almost unthinkable. The demands of the State are accepted as though they were laws of Nature, never to be questioned.

The real problem for the student of Theosophical history is simply this: What has happened to the individual and his awareness of himself as a free moral agent? Perhaps it is simply that the roots of the

Catholic totalitarianism of the Middle Ages have never been completely removed, for the modern man has much in common with his medieval forebears. The medieval man prostrated himself in fear before the conventional pattern woven around a religion teaching that the individual has no intrinsic promise or dignity as a self-moving unit. The modern man tends to prostrate himself before a pattern which is not basically different. The concept of man's evolution as an individual moral being has little philosophical or psychological support from the leading ideas of modern civilization. He is not taught to live, to choose and learn as an individual, but to subordinate himself to the cleverly-propagandized conscription of systems of economics, of nationalism, and of animalistic psychology, which comprise the structure of our society. All of these, translated into the terms of political philosophy, became bases for totalitarianism.

This, clearly enough, is part of the working of the "Karma of Israel"—a result of the personal-God psychology. "Good" men worship at the proper altars; evil men are known to be evil because they worship elsewhere—not because their motives and actions are judged according to the broad principles of justice.

Western man did not invent war, but the religious war is predominantly a Western institution. No torture was too horrible for Torquemada, no butchery too extensive for Simon de Montfort, for these men conceived themselves to be serving the passions of a God who hated those who did not fear him. The entrenchment of anthropomorphism in the psychology of Christendom has made war habitual; the example of a "jealous God" enabled men to hate strongly enough to justify the inhumanities which war entails.

Without the religious sanction, we of the West find it difficult to prosecute a war. This need for moral rationalization is perhaps a good sign, but hate-producing Jehovistic thinking is stronger than the leaven of Christian ethics, which become the pliant tool of propagandists rather than a moral restraint. War clouds continue to gather in the skies of humanity because there is something for them to gather around. And the morally wavering "common man" stands on shifting sands, affected both internally and externally by totalitarian storms. Against the obstacles to his real freedom he can offer a resistance which is only personal and petty.

Actually, the reasons for his partial rebellion may run deeper. The unwillingness of the individual to submit to loss of freedom for the

cause of "national defense" is to be marked everywhere. In Germany, many ingenious techniques were worked out for avoidance of conscription, including the faking or even creation of ailments, the making of false claims, etc. The "draft dodger" and the IV F aspirant in the United States indicated the presence of the same desire to escape the process. Half a million violators of the Selective Service Act of 1940 were investigated by the F.B.I. Most of these recalcitrants had purely personal objections to their loss of freedom; few made conscious individual efforts to evaluate their duty to their nation or to humanity—they simply sought escape from social processes they disliked, or toward which they felt no responsibility. How natural, according to the "ethic" of Self-preservation—held supreme at the expense of all other values—is such behavior! And yet what are men to do? Are they to say that *they* are Good and that *war* is Bad, and on this basis refuse to participate?

Many of the pacifists and other war-resisters sought for abstraction from society on the latter ground. Theosophists sympathetic to the efforts of Thomas Paine in soliciting the co-operation of certain Quakers in the War of Independence will recognize that Paine sought to overcome their lethargy—the lack of social responsibility evidenced by men who, while they wished to see the independence of the colonies, were unwilling to compromise their own "spiritual cleanliness" by fighting for it. Paine, it might be argued, was not objecting to their pacifist position, but to their *reasons* for holding that position. A severe critic of the social irresponsibility of many pacifists, Milton Mayer, himself a conscientious objector, has remarked that the religious pacifist claims war to be a matter between himself and his God, "ignoring a third party to the deal, namely the community." Such a pacifist, Mayer says, "is tolling the bell for himself alone."

In a somewhat similar moral state are those who actually "like" war, who thrive on its activities; who, far from working to eradicate the roots of war in the modern world, make emotional capital of the war experience. There were many in this category in Germany, many in Japan, and a few military leaders among the United Nations hosts who gave evidence of this attitude. It may seem strange to liken a famous General or two, who *like* war, to pacifists who simply *dislike* it personally, yet when men act in a social situation simply from emotional preference, their *moral* situations are similar.

One area of common ground must certainly be shared by all Theosophists, regarding the karmic forces brought into focus by war—and this regardless of opinions as to specific applications of principle to international affairs. The height of *Kali Yuga* is the height of moral inertia. Inertia, that "greatest of occult forces," may be understood in relation to war in two ways: first, as indifference to other peoples' suffering and oppression; second, in the attitude of those who aid in some degree the struggles against oppression, but who tend to accept the easiest salve of conscience, adopting the view that military effort can alone restore justice by punishment of the "wicked." The Theosophist who engages in war has a special obligation to the conscience of the government he serves—*he* is fighting for an ideal which must transcend the common one of self-preservation, and strive to rise above the common emotional level. He must fight *for* the ideal of a common humanity, inclusive even of those who are—for the time—his "enemies." He must oppose oppression wherever he sees it, even if it be that committed by his own country, and justified popularly by "cunningly made-up history." If, on the other hand, the individual Theosophist happens to oppose the many known retrograde influences of militarism and refuses to serve the war-making power of the modern state under conscription, he must remember that he himself is a part of the bloody warfare on the physical plane, even though he is not on the battlefield. It is *his* war to the degree that he shares moral responsibility for it, and none there are, perhaps, who do not.

Fighting and killing, evil though they must be in many of their consequences, must be judged primarily by the motives, by the consecration and the willingness to self-sacrifice which accompanies them. The man who *volunteered* to fight Fascist oppression in Spain during the revolution was not a contributor to moral inertia. He was seeking his own fulfillment of responsibility *in the face of the inertia* which characterizes the majority of moderns. On the other hand, there are hundreds of thousands, millions, who have played their parts in the military machines of the various nations only because they knew no way to avoid it, and because the price of dissociating themselves from a military cause in which they did not believe was more than they were willing to pay. Here is inertia again—the same sort of inertia which led so many Germans into total conscription, submission of even the mind—and finally to sodden acceptance of the mechanized brutality of the Belsens and Maidaneks.

Recent history discloses many extremes between emotional pacifism and emotional war-making, while the true causes of war have been neglected. Extremists—those who, on an emotional basis, either accept war too readily, or reject it completely—cannot help in a solution of the problem. Only the man who understands both the evil of war as a means, and, at the same time, the need for self-sacrifice for the establishment of righteousness, will be able to benefit society by individual application of Theosophical teachings to the needs of his time.

Fundamentally, the man concerned with applying Theosophical principles will find himself fighting for the right and the obligation of the individual, as an individual, to play a *conscious* part in soul evolution—in opposition to the pattern of Kali Yuga.

The Great, the Responsible

Beethoven is a complete artist. If the term is rightly understood, he is one of the completest that ever lived. I intend to use the term without pedantic scruples as to technical details. And, while admitting that "the style is the man," I refuse to involve the reader in vulgar entanglements between the art and the artist's private or official life. Beethoven was of all men the last to tolerate the belief that the artist has a temperament which sets him above the standards of ordinary citizenship, or excuses his failure to reach them. Whatever his sins may have been (and on this subject the evidence is doubtful) he was eminently a man who held himself responsible. Joachim once remarked of a clever French musical critic that "this Parisian shows no sense for the great penitent that there was in Beethoven."

Beethoven was far too busy to torment himself, but Joachim was profoundly right about penitence. It was a quality that was, if possible, more out of fashion in Beethoven's time than it is now. But it will always be inseparable from responsibility so long as human beings have ideals and fail to reach them. I do not know if a modern teacher of auto-suggestion could have shortened John Bunyan's agonies and brought him sooner to his land of Beulah; I am quite certain that no modern psychologist could have found anything more to shake in Beethoven than he could in Browning, or in any other person who has made up his mind about his responsibilities.

—Sir Donald Tovey

"NORMAL CLAIRVOYANCE"

What is night to those who are unenlightened is as day to his gaze.
—*Bhagavad Gita*

THEOSOPHY, above all things else, seeks to cultivate the *normal* in nature and man, to stimulate the natural development of all powers, to produce normal human beings in every walk of life. Normal growth and development is always slow and unspectacular. But we are not satisfied with the slow and orderly processes of nature; we believe rather in the fast methods instituted by modern civilization —in forcing, pushing, cramming—in doing everything in our power, in fact, to bring about quick results. And thus it is that, in every department of life, we find that *ab*normality is the rule.

Whenever one hears the word *clairvoyance,* he looks invariably for some abnormal person as the possessor of it—a medium, a psychic, a lunatic—one who is, in one way or another, wholly or partly unbalanced. Yet it is clear that, were it not that all men possess clairvoyant powers in some measure, it would not be possible to communicate with each other.

Clairvoyance, to the minds of many, means the ability to see forms or visions on the invisible planes of nature. It has nothing to do, so far as such people are concerned, with knowledge, wisdom, or "clear-seeing," which is the real meaning of the term. It connotes simply the power to see visions, without any *understanding* of what one sees. Such, in the view of the ancients, is *not* clear-seeing, or true clairvoyance. It is mere phenomenalism—an abnormal development of the psychic nature of man, which is not only un-spiritual, but definitely dangerous, and has always been warned against by all true teachers.

To see a principle at work on the visible plane is far more spiritual than to see a vision on the invisible plane. The former vision is noetic and implies understanding, while the latter is psychic and material, however sublimated the material may be. The man who "sees" principles is dealing with spirit; the beholder of psychic visions is dealing with matter.

Normal Clairvoyance, says H. P. Blavatsky, will be the common heritage of all mankind in some future period of evolution.

> . . . as the faculties of humanity are multiplied—so will the characteristics of matter be multiplied also. . . . Matter has extension, colour, motion (molecular motion), taste, and smell, corresponding to the existing senses of man, and by the time that it fully develops the next characteristic—let us call it for the moment PERMEABILITY —this will correspond to the next sense of man—let us call it "NORMAL CLAIRVOYANCE." (*S.D.* I, 251-2.)

But evolution, Theosophically considered, begins at the top, and the change in man must therefore precede the change in matter. Before gross matter becomes permeable, man must have developed in himself the power to *see through* it. This can only be done by learning first to see through false ideas, personal opinions, propaganda, and the like. It is these finer forms of matter, and not gross material, that are the real obstacles to clear-seeing at our stage, and until they become permeable to our gaze, no amount of the lower order of clairvoyance will be of any avail.

There is an almost universal tendency in our day to begin at the wrong end in everything that we undertake. So, we substitute the abnormal for the normal. Hatha Yoga, for example, or bodily perfection, is chosen as a goal instead of Raja Yoga, spiritual and mental perfection. We seek to change outer forms and circumstances, in our efforts toward realizing happiness, instead of changing our attitude towards them. Thus it is with our desire for true soul development or clairvoyance: we find it far more inviting to attempt to see visions on the psychic planes than to make an effort to *understand* what we see here and now on this plane.

Theosophy is in the world to re-state for man's benefit the great universal principles of life. These, if studied and applied, call forth and develop the higher spiritual parts of his nature, awakening to life and activity his inherent power to see, to understand, to know. Such is the only true process of normal development, for it is natural, like that of the plant and flower—from within outwards.

The beginning of the cultivation of normal clairvoyance is in the effort to see the working of Law in every thing and in every circumstance. One must learn to look for the occult behind the seemingly insignificant occurrences of life. The Occultist, it is said, never acts until he sees some karmic indication, some sign or tokens that point the way. Nor is an avalanche of help, or obstruction, the only thing

that constitutes for him a sign. The failure of a motor to start when, by all logic, it should start; the absence of some person from his usual place at an inopportune time; the utter inability to lay one's hands upon a desired document, when he thinks he knows exactly where it is; lack of financial means just at a time one desires most to buy some coveted object—all such occurrences, insignificant though they seem, *might* have a meaning. It might be that they are signals from the soul, and they are always taken into account by the Occultist.

Do we, in moments of decision, take into consideration these finer workings of the Law? Are we always ready and willing to forsake a personal plan if karmic indications suggest it to be unwise? Or are we so materialistic in our thinking, so dense and *un*-clairvoyant that nothing short of a cataclysm can cause us to stop and take notice?

Clairvoyance means subtle-seeing, and it is on *this* plane of everyday life that the subtle-sighted must exercise his power, if it is to be of practical value. In the reading of sacred scriptures, for example, the man of normal clairvoyance argues not with words, but sees the meaning and intent of the teacher. In dealing with men, he sees souls behind the human forms and thus can feel the nature of their needs. In every smallest choice, he is always able to see some sign, some subtle karmic pointer, of the course that he should take. And thus he lives a life that is full and rich with meaning.

"THE PRACTICAL PART"

You must find yourself out. And you had better do something concretely practical for some other needy person rather than aim at "ideal thoughts," soaring in clouds and other useless things. Envy no one. You express envy for ——. They need aid as much as you. Their conditions and capacities are not yours: better find and measure your own. As you say, your brain wavers, then give it a long rest and do simple constant acts of kindness for others. . . . There are all too many members who too hastily aspire to be great writers, orators, leaders. . . . The tortoise and not the hare won the race. The purely practical part of the movement needs workers. There are too many dreamers. —W.Q.J.

INDIAN DAYS

A Dialogue of Life and Death: II

By H. P. Blavatsky

[This installment of "Indian Days" is reprinted from the *Theosophical Forum,* June, 1899. (The first installment, reprinted last month, first appeared in May 1899, and not in 1889, as erroneously stated in the Editor's Note.) H.P.B. now takes up the explanation of conditional immortality, a doctrine she considered sufficiently important to warrant her publishing this material again as part of "Dialogue on the Mysteries of the After Life," *Lucifer,* January, 1889 (reprinted in Theosophy III, 98), and including it in Section IX of her *Key to Theosophy.* Here are suggested the laws of mind which determine the focussing of consciousness, and which are thus the key to consciousness of immortality. A belief in immortality serves only the believer, and will not serve indefinitely; conviction of immortality must be gained by each one. It may be intellectually appreciated that the theosophical teaching on this question is no simple formula to be glibly retailed. A world of mortal things, a life of perishable events, and experience with other beings who apparently pass into and out of the limited circle of vitality which is physical existence—these will never prove immortality, for they are only its ephemeral facades. One must see through the ephemera to the immortal reality within. —Eds. Theosophy.]

"MASTER," Narayan had said to Thakur, in the midst of a very hot dispute with the poor Babu, "what is it he is saying, and can one listen to him without being disgusted? He says that nothing remains of the man after he is dead, but that the body of the man simply resolves itself into its component elements, and that what we call the soul, and he calls the temporary consciousness, separates itself, disappearing like the steam of hot water as it cools."

"Do you find this so very astonishing?" said the Master. "The Babu is a Charvaka* and he tells you only that which every other Charvaka would have told you."

"But the Charvakas are mistaken. There are many people who believe that the real man is not his physical covering, but dwells in the mind, in the seat of consciousness. Do you mean to say that in any case the consciousness may leave the soul after death?"

"In *his* case it may," answered Thakur quietly; "because he sincerely and firmly believes in what he says."

---

*A sect of Bengali Materialists.

Narayan cast an astonished and even frightened look at Thakur, and the Babu—who always felt some restraint in the presence of the latter—looked at us with a victorious smile.

"But how is this?" went on Narayan. "The Vedanta teaches us that the spirit is immortal and that the human soul does not die in Parabrahman. Are there any exceptions?"

"In the fundamental laws of the spiritual world there can be no exceptions; but there are laws for the blind and laws for those who see."

"I understand that, but in this case, as I have told him already, his full and final disappearance of consciousness is nothing but the aberration of a blind man, who, not seeing the sun, denies its existence, but all the same he will see the sun with his spiritual sight after he is dead."

"He will not see anything," said the Master. "Denying the existence of the sun now, he could not see it on the other side of the grave."

Seeing that Narayan looked rather upset and that even we, the Colonel and myself, stared at him in the expectation of a more definite answer, Thakur went on reluctantly:

"You speak about the spirit of the Spirit, that is to say about the Atma, confusing this spirit with the soul of the mortal, with Manas. No doubt the spirit is immortal, because being without beginning it is without end; but it is not the spirit that is concerned in the present conversation. It is the human, self-conscious soul. You confuse it with the former, and the Babu denies the one and the other, soul and spirit, and so you do not understand each other."

"I understand him," said Narayan.

"But you do not understand me," interrupted the Master. "I will try to speak more clearly. What you want to know is this. Whether the full loss of consciousness and feeling of oneself is possible after death, even in the case of a confirmed Materialist. Is that it?"

Narayan answered: "Yes; because he completely denies everything that is an undoubted truth for us, and in which we firmly believe."

"All right," said the Master. "To this I will answer positively as follows, though this does not prevent me from believing as firmly as you do in our teaching, which designates the period between two lives as only temporary; whether it is one year or a million that this *entr'acte* between the two acts of the illusion of life lasts, the post-

humous state may be perfectly similar to the state of a man in a very deep fainting-fit, without any breaking of the fundamental rules. Therefore, the Babu in his personal case is perfectly right."

"But how is this," said the Colonel, "since the rule of immortality does not admit of any exceptions, as you said."

"Of course it does not admit of any exceptions, but only in the case of things that really exist. One who has studied the *Mandukya Upanishad* and *Vedanta-sara* ought not to ask such questions," said the Master with a reproachful smile.

"But it is precisely the *Mandukya Upanishad,*" timidly observed Narayan, "which teaches us that between the Buddhi and the Manas, as between the Ishvara and Prajna, there is no more difference in reality than between a forest and its trees, between a lake and its waters."

"Perfectly right," said the Master, "because one or even a hundred trees which have lost their vital sap, or are even uprooted, cannot prevent the forest from remaining a forest."

"Yes," said Narayan, "but in this comparison, Buddhi is the forest, and Manas Taijasa the trees, and if the former be immortal, then how is it possible for the Manas Taijasi, which is the same as Buddhi, to lose its consciousness before a new incarnation? That is where my difficulty lies."

"You will have no difficulties," said the Master, "if you take the trouble not to confuse the abstract idea of the whole with its casual change of form. Remember that if in talking about Buddhi we may say that it is unconditionally immortal, we cannot say the same either about Manas, or about Taijasi. Neither the former nor the latter have any existence separated from the Divine Soul, because the one is an attribute of the terrestrial personality, and the second is identically the same as the first, only with the additional reflection in it of Buddhi. In its turn, Buddhi would be an impersonal spirit without this element, which it borrows from the human soul, and which conditions it and makes of it something which has the appearance of being separate from the Universal Soul, during all the cycle of the man's incarnations. If you say, therefore, that Buddhi-Manas cannot die, and cannot lose consciousness, either in eternity or during the temporary periods of suspension, you would be perfectly right; but to apply this axiom to the qualities of Buddhi-Manas

is the same as if you were arguing that as the soul of the Colonel is immortal, the red on his cheeks is also immortal. And so it is evident you have mixed up the reality, Sat, with its manifestation. You have forgotten that united to the Manas only, the luminousness of Taijasi becomes a question of time, as the immortality and the posthumous consciousness of the terrestrial personality of the man become conditional qualities, depending on the conditions and beliefs created by itself during its lifetime. Karma, the law of perfect balance in the Universe and man, acts unceasingly, and *we reap in the next world the fruit of that which we ourselves have sown in this life.*"

"But, if my Ego may find itself after the destruction of my body in a state of complete unconsciousness, then where is the punishment for the sins committed by me in my lifetime?" asked the Colonel, pensively stroking his beard.

"Our philosophy teaches us," answered Thakur, "that the punishment reaches the Ego only in its next incarnation, and that immediately after our death, we meet only the rewards for the sufferings of the terrestrial life, sufferings that were not deserved by us. So, as you may see, the whole of the punishment *consists in the absence of reward, in the complete loss of the consciousness of happiness and rest.* Karma is the child of the terrestrial Ego, the fruit of the acts of his visible personality, even of the thoughts and intentions of the spiritual I. But at the same time it is a tender mother, who heals the wounds given in the preceding life before striking this Ego and giving him new ones. In the life of a mortal there is no mishap or sorrow which is not a fruit and direct consequence of a sin committed in a preceding incarnation; but not having preserved the slightest recollection of it in his present life, and not feeling himself guilty, and, therefore, suffering unjustly, the man deserves consolation and full rest on the other side of the grave. For our spiritual Ego, Death is always a redeemer and a friend. It is either the peaceful sleep of a baby, or a sleep full of blissful dreams and reveries."

"As far as I remember, the periodical incarnations of the Sutratma* are compared in the Upanishads to the terrestrial life which is

*In the Vedanta, Buddhi, in its combinations with the moral qualities, consciousness, and the notions of the personalities in which it was incarnated, is called Sutratma, which literally means the "thread soul," because a whole row of human lives is strung on this thread like the pearls of a necklace. Manas must become Taijasi in order to reach and to see itself in eternity, when united to Sutratma. But often, owing to sin and associations with the purely terrestrial region, this very luminousness disappears completely.

spent, term by term, in sleeping and waking. Is that so?" I asked, wishing to renew the first question of Narayan.

"Yes, it is so; that is a very good comparison."

"I do not doubt it is good," I said, "but I hardly understand it. After the awakening, the man merely begins a new day, but his soul, as well as his body, are the same as they were yesterday; whereas, in every new incarnation not only his exterior, sex, and even personality, but, as it seems to me, all his moral qualities, are changed completely. And then, again, how can this comparison be called true, when people, after their awakening, remember very well not only what they were doing yesterday, but many days, months, and even years ago, whereas, in their present incarnations, they do not preserve the slightest recollection about any past life, whatever it was. Of course a man, after he is awake, may forget what he has seen in his dreams, but still he knows that he was sleeping and that during his sleep he lived. But about our previous life we cannot say even that we lived. What do you say to this?"

"There are some people who do remember some things," enigmatically answered Thakur, without giving a direct answer to my question.

"I have some suspicions on this point, but it cannot be said about ordinary mortals. Then how are we, we who have not reached as yet the Samma Sambuddha,* to understand this comparison?"

"You can understand it when you better understand the characteristics of the three kinds of what we call sleep."

"This is not an easy task you propose to us," said the Colonel, laughingly. "The greatest of our physiologists have got so entangled in this question that it has become more confused than ever."

"It is because they have undertaken what they had no business to undertake,—the answering of this question being the duty of the psychologist, of whom there are hardly any among your European scientists. A Western psychologist is only another name for a physiologist, with the difference that they work on principles still more material. I have recently read a book by Maudsley which showed me clearly that they try to cure the soul's diseases without believing in the existence of the soul."

(To be concluded.)

---

*The knowledge of one's past incarnations. Only Yogis and Adepts of the Occult Sciences possess this knowledge, by the aid of the most ascetic life.

THE ENERGIC FIELD OF MIND

WE think, yet know not how thought is produced. The source and nature of the energies that set ideas in motion remain enigmas to the psychologist. Certain electric phenomena relative to the brain have been noted, but whether these are the cause of thought, or are set in motion by thought, is still to be determined. Moreover, the difference between pure thought—sometimes called meditation—and thought that energizes particular action is not even considered. Nevertheless these two categories play a most important part in the Karma of the reincarnating ego.

Through meditation all the aspirations and holy desires are expanded and strengthened, and though they may not be realized on the plane of action in one lifetime, they shape fundamentally the vehicle and mind of the future life. It is through meditation that the dynamics of spiritual knowledge can be brought into the mind's sphere of perception. Theosophy places the source of self-consciousness in the higher Manas—illuminated by pure spirit. Any omission of spirit, and the spiritual aspect of mind, will inevitably develop a materialized psychology inhibiting a true understanding of the nature of the energic mind—the inner magnetic field of thought. The potentially powerful field of the inner thinker acts as the medium for transforming spiritual energy into the subtle forces of brain and nerve.

The generic and ancient name given to the cosmic aspect of these forces is Fohat—occult electricity—which has a potential relative to each of the seven planes of being, and in its multiple aspects creates the connecting links between the modes of ideation on these planes. This process is open to study, for there is a direct connection between the deep-sleep consciousness of spirit and the dream state. The egoic realities of the spiritual state are "stepped down" into corresponding symbols of the dream state; then, in the waking state, these dream pictures reveal their meaning through the intuitive powers. They are like charades enacted for instruction, inspiration, or warning to the personality. A dream may represent but a moment of waking time, and yet in that moment the energy employed can bring together a great variety of details drawn from the brain. These are woven into a series of living scenes in which the dreamer partici-

pates. That this backdrop of ideation is not understood is largely because the actor steps upon the stage of waking consciousness forgetting or ignoring what is behind him, and concentrates upon the audience with which he associates the idea of reality. If, however, he pauses between scenes to examine his backdrop, he may find a means to better enact the theme of his play.

As yet the postulate that every form of energy is inseparable from intelligence has not been accorded recognition in the halls of science. It is nevertheless a fundamental part of the occult system. Divorce occult energy and intelligence, and the result will always be a mechanistic conception of the brain's activities, devoid of any moral or ethical relation. Just as the producer is called in once the play is written, to assemble all associated elements, scenes, actors and technicians, so occult electricity—the agent of egoic intelligence—organizes ideation between plane and plane of the inner perception. Without this help ideas could not be carried beyond the primary stage of contemplation.

There is a distinction to be made between thought and ideation. The idea emerges from, or is the reflection of, the archetype—the ideal conception of an imagined or known theme or object. The archetype is the child of countless ages of the evolution of ideas, beyond which finite mind cannot penetrate. To understand its practical application, we might consider the wheel as an archetype. No human genius can better the idea of the wheel. Upon its perfect relationship of the center to circumference has been built the modern era of what is called industrial civilization. To be sure, there are countless types of wheels, but the archetype is always present beneath the particular elaboration of hub, spokes, or tire.

Thought is called into action by the alerting of the consciousness upon the perception of an inner idea, or outward object, perceived through the senses. In making the distinction between ideation and thought, the former is to be assigned to Manas in its higher aspect, the latter to the lower manas—that which, hand in hand with desire, impels and operates the brain's activities. Ideas belong to the ego's gallery of pictures—thoughts, to the artist at work, a work ever falling into definable patterns.

The limitations of each mind determine the extent of the field in which its energies may expand. These limitations may be thought of as self-imposed through life after life of expansion or contraction of mental activity; but the source of mental energy is exhaustless, and there are few limits to its possible use. It radiates from the One Life, which is the basis of all individual lives, and the capacity for its use is limited only by the vehicle which man himself builds. A period of rest is necessary for adjustment after the intake of energy, as it follows also the expenditure of energy with cyclic precision. Sleep is needed to allow the body to absorb the excess energy developed during waking activity. In the mental field, life is experienced on a higher plane and at a greater rate of vibration than the physical, and therefore its periods of action and rest may succeed each other in almost imperceptible cycles. This is the cause of the instability of the untrained mind: it tends to fly from subject to subject—from point to point—until a saturation of energy is reached. The one-pointed mind is a mind able to insulate the energy generated by an idea against its dissipation in the field of associated ideas—the brain's storage of memory. If the energy is allowed to escape, it is lost in the endless labyrinth of the brain cells, which are necessary to thought, but useful only to the extent that energy is controlled. During the rest periods, either long or short, synthesizing intelligence utilizes this energy to adjust the idea to its proper associations. This is the basis for the mental phenomenon, so often noted, that causes the solution of a problem to enter the consciousness like a flash. The sequence may be stated as follows: there is the establishment of an idea in the field of mind, followed by a period of intense exercise upon the idea, such as research affords; then a period of rest after which the synthetic idea, now itself a secondary archetype, is formulated as a new and basic center for mental activity.

Mental deposits carried from life to life are the synthesized reactions to ideas. These lie in two categories, those produced by reflection—thought on the plane of ideas—and thought coincident to action on the plane of the physical man. They remain as subtle deposits in the soul's memory—seeds to fructify in future incarnations. It must be remembered that although the mind-principle remains constant, there is a new "working mind" for each incarnation. The

seeds of former minds are its basis and cause. It is, however, new only in the sense that causes are reassembled in a fresh pattern for action—the pattern of Karma. No matter how intense the devachanic bliss may have been, the reincarnating ego has to meet both physical and mental effects of causes created by former activity in a body. To these effects is due the initial development of the personality, for Karma is so integrated with mental deposits that motivation, potential reaction to environment and to affinities, follows in a well-formulated trend from childhood. However, those currents due entirely to study and meditation upon the Supreme Spirit, which have produced the upsurge of spiritual knowledge within the egoic consciousness, are above the field in which Karma is felt, and become the energy of the inner voice we call conscience. It is not rare to see one who, though passing through distressing physical Karma, is inwardly illuminated by a light which enables others to see more clearly. Conscience is then more than a far-off voice—it may envelop the entire inner being with light under which no evil can prowl.

Karma is interwoven in the very structure of the newly developing mind of each incarnation. Acting upon the several planes of being up to that of spirit, Karma eventually leads each individual to seek an understanding of its processes. Karma is of the ego's own making, and therefore he must mirror himself in such a way as to able to see and understand that which he has done, and is doing, to produce good or bad effects. The problem is one of long-sustained intention to cut through the wall of belief. It is not the teachings nor our experiences which fail us, but what we believe regarding them. One may study every aphorism on Karma, and every definition the teachings afford, and yet "believe" erroneously. Therefore each belief—each reaction, in fact—should be laid aside until tested through observation and self-examination. Gradually success comes and the ego is able to step aside, to see himself wearing the karmic garments he has woven. A new sense of responsibility then awakens and there arises a desire in the individual to willingly exhaust all karmic effects rather than to escape and forget. There can be no erroneous belief in the light of such a position, and if Karma has yet to fall with heavy blows, the ego is prepared to receive them with fortitude, knowing his own has come back to him.

Much is said in *The Secret Doctrine* about the Akasa of which the astral light is the lower aspect. The latter is the recorder of all the thoughts and acts of man, but the Akasa contains the ultimate spiritual knowledge attainable by divine man under cyclic law. The ego may choose which medium he will work with. As the all-enveloping air gives life and energy to the body, so the Akasa provides the spiritual mind with its energizing ideas. But like air which has become impregnated with contagion, the astral light infects the lower mind with the insidious virus of evil if that mind is allowed to become passive. The mind which refuses to alert itself to unwelcome suggestion becomes a center of attraction in the astral light for that which is magnetically sympathetic to it. Therefore even the passive mind becomes selectively active in the astral accretions of man's lower thoughts and acts.

The divine heritage of the ego is neither generally accepted nor understood, and yet it must be assumed during life in a body. Through the medium of his divine nature the ego attains to higher strata of thought. Is it not reasonable to accept the position that no such exalted state can be attained while the lower nature has its metaphysical doors and windows open to the insidious astral atmosphere?

Changes in man's nature are gradual. The Karma of ages must run its course. If there appears to be a sudden turning-point, it is because the Karma then in action has reached its final adjustment, and new Karma begins to make its effects felt. Life cannot be still; the ego is subjected to the shifting light and shade of material existence until the soul yearns for a better perception of selfhood. There are few who cannot recall some moment when the inner perception awakened to truth. Such an experience may come after a great sorrow, or at a moment of unselfish achievement; or, with a soul accustomed to contemplation, a mood of nature may quietly work upon the inner sphere, causing the vibratory mind to attune itself to the spiritual plane of thought. In these ways Life itself fixes the attention upon that which belongs to the higher nature, and the unexplored spiritual environment becomes reality. With faith and energy devoted to this new concept of reality, the words of Great Ones who have attained perfection become practical instructions rather than mystical ideals.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS AT HOME

"IT looks like Bill's growing up and having troubles," remarked Paul as the Family sat down to dinner one evening. Bill was the chap about whom Father and Paul had had their after-midnight talk some time ago, but Father gave no more sign of recognition than a slight raising of an eyebrow.

"He was telling me that his family want him to be a lawyer—that's what his father is," Paul continued, "but Bill doesn't want to be cooped up in an office all his life. He wants to buy a ranch—when he gets the money—and breed horses. Seems to me he's right. He's a natural for the outdoors, you know."

"So say we all of us, if we have the chance," said Father, with a hint of regret for his own stuffy office showing in his voice. "I wonder how many men there are who don't long for that kind of freedom. Every one of us at some time or another must want to be where Nature meant us all to be, with the earth for our desk and chair, and the wind for our secretary, and the sky for our ledgers." Father lapsed silent, captured, perhaps, by the spell of unsuspected poetry in his words. Rousing himself, he added, grinning at Paul:

"Where's the man who wouldn't prefer the sound of a quiet bubbling stream to the clacking of an office typewriter?"

"Well, if he really wants it, he can go after it," replied Paul, always impatient with idle dreams. "There are too many people who go on all their lives saying how much they'd like to do a certain thing, but never making enough effort to do it. If they really wanted to live a natural life, they would do it, because nothing could stop them."

"Well, then, what are you worrying about Bill for?" asked Chris, with the easy confidence of an uncomplicated mind. "He'll keep in touch with nature if he really wants to. There's always the sky—and what about the Wind, Sand and Stars? I think the real nature-lover loves whatever 'nature' is around him!"

"That's the point, isn't it?" said Mother. "We sometimes talk of 'getting away from it all' and communing with Nature, but really it's our own nature—the inner confusions and disturbances we carry around with us—that we're trying to escape. Nature can take us out of ourselves, and restore our sense of balance, but some day we must be able to *keep* our balance no matter what 'nature' we're working in."

"I've never heard of anybody communing with a sidewalk," Chris remarked, with a down-to-earth flourish. "But we've got a lot more to do with that than we have with the lonesome pine!"

"You spoke about stresses and strains, Mother." Paul was bent on developing his point. "That's just what I mean. Frustration arises in people who aren't doing what they want to be doing, and from them it spreads to others. If men were happy, they'd avoid most, if not all, the conflicts between them!"

"Materialist!" scoffed Chris. "Think you're going to make all men brothers by sending them 'back to Nature' and turning city people into farmers?"

"Not at all," was Paul's answer. "I don't intend to turn anyone into anything. All I'm saying is that a man isn't going to be happy until he's doing what he's happy doing. That's simple enough, isn't it? As for farmers, maybe there are lots of *them* who would be happier living in the city!

"Seems to me you've not answered Chris, Paul," interjected Father. "No matter how you put it, you're still saying that happiness is a condition produced by external circumstances, and not by *attitudes.*"

" 'Et tu, Brute!' Isn't anyone on *my* side?" laughed Paul.

"Well," said Chris, with a magnanimous air, "I'll go along this far with you: I wouldn't spend *my* life behind a desk just because Dad thought I'd make a good executive—not that I think he does."

Paul acknowledged this rather dubious support with a little bow and turned to answer Father.

"I'm not saying that a man's happiness is produced by conditions, Dad, but a man's happiness is produced by creating the conditions in which he *can* be happy. It just isn't logical to sit down on a heap of unpleasant conditions and suffer!"

"Oh! Is suffering the only response we can make to unpleasant conditions?" Mother doesn't see much logic in either "sitting down" or "suffering," for she believes that both habits encourage each other.

"Well, as far as Bill's concerned," replied Paul, "he'd be a goner if he had to spend his life in a law-office!"

"Perhaps he would," said Mother briskly. "If he took up law without a reason—and I don't count liking and disliking as reasons—he would make himself downright miserable."

Before Paul could rise to protest this affront to the Individual and his Pursuit of Happiness, Madge was speaking.

"Take the career of a social worker," she argued. "You can't tell me that every one who goes into it does so because he likes to work in disagreeable surroundings."

"Well, that's all right, because obviously he must like social work more than he dislikes the surroundings. And that's my point—unless he *wants* to do it, he shouldn't." Paul was firm in ruling out the necessity for sacrifice. "Confucius had the right idea. When each individual is at peace with himself, then the world will be happy."

"I've no doubt Confucius had the right idea, Paul," Mother said with a smile. "But I somehow wonder if you have the right idea of Confucius. How does the individual manage to gain peace?"

"Obviously, by getting to know himself," replied Paul unhesitatingly. "If man has seven principles, as Theosophy teaches, that means he has a lot to do just to get his own life in order."

"Well, Paul," pursued Mother, "Confucius said that each man should attain peace within himself, in order to bring all men together in peace. I don't think he meant for every man to go out and look for whatever would make *him* happy, and settle down with that! In the last analysis, is there any peace without brotherhood, and can there be brotherhood without sacrifice?"

"But Theosophy isn't the philosophy of martyrdom, either," Paul persisted. "There's no substitute for a man's own choice."

"Let's look at it this way," Father suggested. "If we're seeking happiness *only* for ourselves—and that is what we usually call pleasure—we're really only trying to avoid certain conditions and to obtain others. But the most pleasant circumstances conceivable cannot relieve us of unpleasant memories and imaginings. Then, too, pleasure requires that a certain condition be stable, and since that is clearly impossible, it should be just as clear that every pleasure will end in pain—when the condition changes."

"It all seems to end up in a paradox," Madge concluded. "The only way we can find happiness is by forgetting it, and when we set out to find it, we place it beyond our reach. Pleasure comes naturally, but happiness comes from achieving something more, from creating something fine—and that's hard work!"

KOSMOS AND NATURE

THE fact that the cosmology of the *Timaeus* is heavily charged with myth is often used by modern writers in reproof of Plato. The interpretation of his views on the physical world has always been the subject of debate. Even in the Academy itself there was division of opinion as to what Plato meant. But it is only when we come to present-day exponents of classical scholorship that we find at times the essential dogmatism of the materialist. An instance is seen in Professor Benjamin Farrington's economic interpretation of the Greek philosopher's mind: "Plato's thought was corrupted by his approval of the slave society in which he lived" (*Greek Science*, 1944). This, notwithstanding the same writer's own admission of the sparse materials for forming anything like final judgment on any aspect of Greek life and thought. "Apart from the Hippocratic Corpus," he writes, "we have no complete works of Greek philosophy or science extant before Plato," and he further states that, although we have Plato's published work, the record of his oral instruction in the Academy has not survived. Much of this kind of *argumentum ad invidiam* might have been avoided if writers on the lore of antiquity had accepted symbolism as the Mystery language of pre-historic ages, which survives in the myths of later periods, both symbol and myth embodying the strange records of a verified cosmogony and cosmology.

A posthumous work by Professor R. G. Collingwood (Waynfleet Professor of Metaphysical Philosophy at Oxford University) shows one modern scholar, at any rate, who was prepared to adopt H. P. Blavatsky's dictum: "Everything in Nature has to be judged by analogy" (*S.D.* I, 116 fn) in tracing the history of cosmological interpretation. He considered that cosmology today is, like its predecessors, based on analogy:

> As Greek natural science was based on the analogy between the macrocosm nature and the microcosm man, as man is revealed to himself in his own self-consciousness; as Renaissance natural science was based on the analogy between nature as God's handiwork and the machines that are the handiwork of man; so the modern view of nature . . . is based on the analogy between the processes of the natural world as studied by natural scientists and the vicissitudes of human affairs as studied by historians. (*The Idea of Nature*, 1945.)

While some may question the particular relations whose similitude is here drawn, no one will doubt the significance of the mode of interpretation. (The use of this occult method may have a bearing on the fact that Professor Collingwood enjoys other sound intuitions on Plato and Greek philosophy.) There is an eternal law of correspondence and analogy in manifestation, which finds its explanation in the ancient teaching that "the whole Kosmos has sprung from the DIVINE THOUGHT" (*S.D.* I, 340). Plato makes the statement in the *Phaedo* that "if we are ever to know anything absolutely, we must be free from the body, and must behold the actual realities with the eye of the soul alone." Those who have learned something of the Mystery teaching will understand the meaning of these words. But, short of this direct perception, much may be learnt by analogy, and it is idle to imagine, as does Professor Farrington, that not till the time of Kepler did astronomy (as part of cosmological studies) "rid itself of the necessity of interpreting the behaviour of the planets in terms of the social prejudices of the Pythagoreans." The fundamental Marxian objection to Plato's general teaching is really due to the Greek sage's insistence (in this he was speaking in the Pythagorean tradition) that any attempt to reform public life must be preceded by the training of a new type of individual.

Certain it is that Plato taught that the soul of the world was fashioned by the Demiurgus before its body, and that there is a relation of his astronomical system to Pythagorean science. In all this there is an echo of the Wisdom of old, reiterated in modern times by H. P. Blavatsky:

> Occultism teaches that no form can be given to anything, either by nature or by man, whose ideal type does not already exist on the subjective plane. More than this; that no such form or shape can possibly enter man's consciousness, or evolve in his imagination, which does not exist in prototype, at least as an approximation. (*S.D.* I, 282 fn.)

Since the appearance of *The Secret Doctrine* in 1888, much explanation of Plato's writings has been essayed in the light of scientific thought, and signs are not wanting of a reversion to one or other of the fundamental doctrines of the Esoteric Philosophy. "The safest general characterisation of the European tradition," writes Professor A. N. Whitehead, "is that it consists of a series of footnotes to Plato."

Further, he has expressed the opinion that the *Timaeus* comes nearer than any other book to providing the philosophical setting required by the ideas of modern physical science. Professor Collingwood has remarked on the coincidence of the *Timaeus* background with the general cosmological views of Professor Whitehead himself. "In both cases," he wrote, "the world of nature is a complex of movements, or processes in space and time, presupposing another complex, namely, a world of forms which Whitehead calls eternal objects, not in space and time." If we add to this view a refusal to accept anything inorganic in the Kosmos, and, as a parallel to the existence of "a primordial Substance diffused throughout boundless Space, *of an intellectual and divine Nature*" (*S.D.* I, 594), the certainty that "as the faculties of humanity are multiplied—so will the characteristics of matter be multiplied also" (*S.D.* I, 252)—then we shall be within hail of the much despised occult teachings!

Nothing could be more remote from the truth than Prof. Farrington's suggestion *(ibid)* that the substitution of the Pythagorean cosmological theory of number for that of fire as the First Principle, marked a stage in the separation of philosophy from the technique of production. This is totally to misconceive the import of the teachings. It is truer to say, with Professor Collingwood, that "the tendency of Plato's Pythagorean cosmology was to explain the behaviour of natural things as an effect of their mathematical structure." When the Pythagoreans found in mathematics also an instrument for the purification of the soul, they were not thinking in terms of magnitude, expressed in numbers or limited to a simple triad, line, surface, and body, to which (as H. P. Blavatsky tells us, *S.D.* I, 615) Aristotle dwarfed the metaphysical idea by omitting the Point and the Circle and taking no account of the Apex. Rather had they in mind the fact that Geometry is the fifth divine Science, " 'fifth'—because it is the *fifth key* in the series of the Seven Keys to the Universal esoteric language and symbology" (*S.D.* II, 471). The science is said to have been invented by Osiris-Isis, and it was Geometry as a "divine Science" that Plutarch had in mind when he wrote:

> The function of geometry is to draw us away from the sensible and the perishable to the intelligible and the eternal. For the contemplation of the eternal is the end of philosophy, as the contemplation of the mysteries is the end of religion.

For the Pythagoreans, as for every initiated Greek philosopher, the nature of things is geometrical structure or form: it is this which determines why they are what they are, severally and collectively. Plato taught in the same tradition, and the whole of his cosmology is to be read in this sense. It is absurd to suppose (with Professor Farrington) that when Plato came to the end of his knowledge in any direction (or is alleged to have done so) he had recourse to a myth, or that science with Plato "became a way of *knowing,* which, in the absence of any practical test, meant only talking consistently." The truth is far otherwise, even on the exoteric plane:

> . . . for Plato the real or intelligible is not physical at all, it is pure form without any matter; physicality is for Plato one characteristic of the perceptible, and whatever is physical is to that extent not intelligible. *(The Idea of Nature.)*

The influence of this view upon subsequent thought is a matter of history. The attribution of the formula H_2O to the constituents of water is an application of the Pythagorean principle, "and the whole of modern physics, with its mathematical theories of light, radiation, atomic structure, and so forth, is a continuation of the same line of thought, and a vindication of the Pythagorean point of view." The tradition was carried on by Galileo, who has been called the true father of modern science, when he declared that the book of nature is written in the language of mathematics. "For the Aristotelian doctrine that change is an expression of tendency, the sixteenth century substituted the Platonic doctrine—strictly the Pythagorean doctrine, for in essence it is pre-Socratic—that change is a function of structure." And, on the threshold of the Atomic Age, it has been observed that chemical quality is not dependent upon weight, but upon an electronic pattern, not static, but dynamic, "constantly changing in a definite rhythmical way, like the rhythmical patterns discovered by the Pythagoreans in the field of acoustics" *(ibid).*

There is a totality of knowledge corresponding to the aggregate of nature, and, in relation to cosmology and natural science, the ancients are making their voices heard amid the din of our modern contentious world. "To make of Science an integral *whole* necessitates, indeed, the study of spiritual and psychic, as well as physical Nature" (*S.D.* I, 588). We have to universalize our conceptions of both Kosmos and Nature. In that connection, the meaning of the

two words is not without interest. Alexander von Humboldt, in his *Cosmos* (Eng. ed. 1849) points out that in the most ancient and precise definition of the word, Kosmos signified *ornament,* figuratively implying the order or adornment of a discourse. Testimony shows that it was Pythagoras who first used the word to designate the order of the universe and the universe itself (*vide* Plutarch, *De Plac. Phil.,* II, 1). Plato describes the heavenly bodies by the name of *Uranos,* but the order pervading the regions of space he, too, terms the Cosmos. "It was not until long after the time of the Ptolemies that the word was applied to the earth," wrote von Humboldt. Uranos, H. P. Blavatsky tells us in *The Secret Doctrine* (II, 268 fn), "is a modified Varuna, 'the Universal encompasser,' the all-embracer, and one of the oldest of the Vedic deities—SPACE. . . . 'his secrets and those of Mitra *are not to be revealed to the foolish*'."

As to Nature, in modern European languages the word is used in a collective sense for the sum total or aggregate of natural things. In its original and strictly proper meaning, Professor Collingwood points out that it "refers not to a collection but to a 'principle,' again in the proper sense of that word, a *principium,*" or source. Indeed, for the Ionian philosophers, he reminds us, Nature "never meant the world or the things which go to make up the world, but always something inhering in these things which made them behave as they did." In the *Timaeus,* the soul of the world pervades its entire body (and so with the Kosmos):

> Nature, taken in its abstract sense, *cannot* be "unconscious," as it is the emanation from, and thus an aspect (on the manifested plane) of, the ABSOLUTE consciousness. Where is that daring man who would presume to deny to vegetation and even to minerals *a consciousness of their own?* All he can say is, that this consciousness is beyond his comprehension. (*S.D.* I, 277 fn.)

To the degree of his self-conscious life, man's responsibilities increase. He should ever be "striving to help the divine evolution of *Ideas,* by becoming to the best of his ability a *co-worker with nature* in the cyclic task" (*S.D.* I, 280). In that duty, he will do well to remember, and thus remind dogmatists of every kind, of the pregnant words of Hegel, who, in protest against finality, wrote at the end of his philosophy of history: "*Bis hierher ist das Bewusstseyn gekommen*" —That is as far as consciousness has reached.

EVERYDAY QUESTIONS

On Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms

APHORISM 9 *(Book III): Here it is said that there are two trains of self-reproductive thought, but that the mind, in passing from one to the other, is concerned with both those trains. Is it possible for the mind to* THINK *of two things or subjects at the same time?*

Self-reproductive thought must be based upon some genuine apprehension of reality, else it is not thought, but simply the recording of impressions. There are, however, two "realities." There is the reality of any given moment, the relationships between beings at any certain point in time, and there is the reality of a universal spiritual evolution—which has nothing to do with "physical" time—and which represents the highest principle of both man and nature. For man, the problem of understanding is dual—he must understand the phenomenal world by correlating the activities of any, and finally all, manifested beings with his own activities. He must also understand, through the medium of his highest faculties, the *noumenal* essence, the changeless, in and beyond all diversities in beings. He must cognize both the phenomenal world and the noumenal world at the same time, neither abstract philosophical understanding nor specific knowledge being sufficient in itself. *Nirodha* is described as that state wherein comprehension of *both* exists. "Be ye wise as serpents and harmless as doves" is a saying which indicates the necessity for knowing the complexities of the objective world while retaining the calmness of spiritual understanding of the whole as the whole.

It is not possible to think of two "things" or "subjects" at the same time, but it is possible and finally necessary to see both aspects of life, phenomenal and noumenal, at the same time.

Aphorism 10: *What more could be asked of the mind than "an uniform flow"*—NIRODHA? *Or, could it logically be concluded that this refers to the flow between higher and lower manas?*

It is one thing to observe the inter-penetration of two different spheres of intelligence, and quite another, to form from that preliminary knowledge a perfect synthesis. A "uniform flow" between higher and lower manas means that the body and the psychic energies are

controlled by understanding, but it is said that the trained seer can see the "All" in any one "object." Nirodha might be regarded as a state of wise flexibility, while *Ekagrata* is the attainment of a wise concentration. It is interesting to note that here, as in many other portions of Patanjali's instructions, the teacher describes state after state of Yogic attainment. The reader may be somewhat disconcerted to discover that just when Patanjali seems to have described *the* state most important to attain, he immediately proceeds to outline further steps in the deepening of perception. The profundity of this method should not escape notice, for it conveys the constant suggestion of further evolution, through and beyond *any* state. Patanjali's disciples could not think there is a final achievement in real Yoga. To formulate *the* end of all attainment would invite the student to imagine he had mastered ultimate knowledge every time he reached anything that vaguely resembled "The Goal." Actually, there will always be further steps in spiritual evolution. The first sign of progress toward a goal is not proof that the goal has been attained. The man who seeks *Samadhi,* for instance, may think that almost any semi-spiritual psychic experience *is Samadhi*—if *Samadhi* is the only description offered him of a "spiritual state." One of the minor curses of profane, popular religions is in their over-simplification of all descriptions of inner attainment. Not one word-symbol, nor two, but many are needed to impress powerfully upon the aspirant that evolution is an *endless* series of progressive awakenings.

Aphorism 14: *Is this Aphorism to be understood—together with the note—in connection with Aphorism* 45, *Book I? Is there any relation with* EKAGRATA, *of Aphorism* 12, *Book III? If* EKAGRATA *is a synonym of Mahat, as the* GLOSSARY *states, it would seem impossible to reach such a state.*

All roads to perception of Reality, whether they begin with the problem of understanding the phenomenal world, or the problem of understanding the noumenal world, must end with perception of the "two in one." Concentration upon any "subtle object," states Aphorism 45, Book I, "ends with the indissoluble element called primordial matter." Primordial and universal Mahat—*Eka*—are both descriptions of reality. Mind and matter are not separate, even though, as stated in the *Voice,* "the self of matter and the SELF of

Spirit can never meet." To see truly that there is universal intelligence *in* matter—and universal matter in intelligence—is to enter a state of "Ekagrata."

Aphorism 19: *Here it is stated: "The nature of the mind of another person becomes known to the ascetic when he concentrates his own mind on that of another person." Yet, Aphorism* 20 *shows that only the performance of* SANYAMA *with that object in view will reveal the* FUNDAMENTAL BASIS *of the other person's mind.*

(a) Why is MOTIVE *so little emphasized in Patanjali?*

(b) Is the present-day "mind reader" to be considered in the class with Patanjali's "ascetic"?

(a) Motive is not under-emphasized in Patanjali. It is simply not *called* motive. It should be remembered that Patanjali's Yoga instructions are entirely in the nature of a scientific treatise, and exclude religious or devotional exhortation. Motive in Patanjali is discussed indirectly in terms of the highest states of consciousness, for these involve an ever-clearer perception of the "One in All"—the basis for universal interdependence and the feeling of brotherhood. Patanjali may be said to insist upon two points in respect to what we call motive. First, that the highest motive is impossible without the highest knowledge. Second, that the *first stages* of concentration and meditation may be attained by any man who desires them ardently, with *whatever* motive. But Patanjali insists that until the higher forms of knowledge are attained (right motive), it is impossible to have *perfection* of any of the powers of Yoga. Patanjali is attempting to lay a basis for understanding what "right motive" is, rather than telling his disciples to be sure to have it—as the protagonists of all religions never tire of doing.

(b) None of the modern "mind readers" have followed the disciplines which Patanjali lists as prerequisites for the ascetic, so they can hardly be considered "in the same class."

There is an extremely important distinction between casual "mind reading" and that concentration which enables a man to know the fundamental basis of another's mind. The former "accomplishment" may be purely a passive psychic sensitivity which enables specific astral impressions to be read. The latter has to do, not with petty

details, nor yet with invading the privacy of a man's creative thoughts, but rather with understanding the whole general trend and color of another's life-current of thought. Only an adept can accurately sense the nature of this general trend.

MYSTERY AND MIRACLE

The very nature and design of religion, if I may so express it, prove even to demonstration that it must be free from everything of mystery, and unencumbered with everything that is mysterious. Religion, considered as a duty, is incumbent upon every living soul alike, and, therefore, must be on a level with the understanding and comprehension of all.

When men, whether from policy or pious fraud, set up systems of religion incompatible with the word or works of God in the creation, and not only above, but repugnant to human comprehension, they were under the necessity of inventing or adopting a word that should serve as a bar to all questions, inquiries and speculations. . . . As *mystery* answered all general purposes, *miracle* followed as an occasional auxiliary. The former served to bewilder the mind, the latter to puzzle the senses. The one was the lingo, the other the legerdemain.

Mankind have conceived to themselves certain laws by which what they call nature is supposed to act; and that a miracle is something contrary to the operation and effect of those laws; but unless we know the whole extent of those laws, and of what are commonly called the powers of nature, we are not able to judge whether anything that may appear to us wonderful or miraculous be within, or be beyond, or be contrary to, her natural power of acting.

In every point of view in which those things called miracles can be placed and considered, the reality of them is improbable and their existence unnecessary. . . . for it is more difficult to obtain belief to a miracle than to a principle evidently moral without any miracle. . . . Moral principle speaks universally for itself. . . . It is necessary to the full and upright character of truth that it rejects the crutch, and it is consistent with the character of fable to seek the aid that truth rejects.

—THOMAS PAINE

ON THE LOOKOUT

The Classics in Our Time

In the growing revolt against the tyranny of a machine civilization, the modern heirs to ancient wisdom are closing their ranks. Beguiled, not by the abstract formulations of scientific theory, but by the promise of short-cuts to health and the satisfaction of insatiable appetites, the world pays its ignorant homage to scientific discovery. Yet, it is true that philosophical minds everywhere are securing wider attention to views that have for long been unpopular: the moral responsibility attaching to intellectual achievements, the rightful place to which humanistic studies are entitled in modern education, and the increasing respect that should be paid to the voices of antiquity. A presidential address to the Classical Association at the Senate House of London University illustrates the point (London *Times,* April 17). It was given by Lord Greene, Master of the Rolls and eminent British Jurist. Taking as his subject "Classics and the Social Revolution of Our Time," Lord Greene said that he foresaw a long period during which civilization would be subject to disruptive influences and violent strains. It seemed to him that, in this situation, while few would indulge in classical scholarship, all could learn fundamental lessons from the classics, the humanities in the widest sense.

"A Conception of Humanity"

Lord Greene summarized what lessons had been learnt best in the past from Greece and Rome:

> Integrity of mind, and the habit of following the argument wherever it might lead; accuracy of thought and expression and the impulse to reject what was slovenly or superficial; distrust of the catchword and all undue simplifications; the habit and method of reasoned criticism which forbade us to accept or reject a proposition merely because it was pleasant or because it saved the trouble of thought; the power to recognize and enjoy beauty in all its forms. . . . Lastly, there was what combined all those qualities in one balanced whole, a conception of humanity in which its capacities could attain their full development and the spirit could reach out in all directions for those delights of reason and beauty which "glow before the common steps of life."

"THE LIE IN THE SOUL"

We are apt to forget, Lord Greene continued, that science itself was a great humanity:

> Science, if it were to be true to itself, must possess integrity of mind; it must follow the argument; its thoughts must be accurate, its approach critical, its language precise; it must shun superficiality as the lie in the soul. . . . But these characteristics would make up but half a man. They must be warmed and illumined by the human quality of the man himself. A race that knew and cared for nothing but science and its practical application would, if left to itself, become as soulless and mechanical as the formulas that it invented and the engines that it created; just as a race that knew and cared for nothing but the humanities would end its life in dreams or in some cloister of the mind.

If the "uneasy lack of balance," which Lord Greene said he found in human life today (a symptom is the growing discontent with what life has to offer), is to be remedied by the humanities, the esoteric content of classical thought will have to be recognized as well as the fact pointed out long ago by Professor Max Muller, that "the Veda is the real Theogony of the Aryan races, while that of Hesiod is a distorted caricature of the original image." Here is a rich field of research for those students of the classics who wish to apply something more than philological study to the problems of this modern age.

HUMAN NATURE AND ONE WORLD

The truth that emerges from the growing concern with what the ancients taught and believed is that our modern problems are still fundamentally those of human nature in its varied manifestations. The message of a living, unitary world is not peculiar to the twentieth century. It is as old as human thought itself. Unfortunately, experience alone seems capable of teaching the lesson conveyed by Pascal when he wrote:

> the entire succession of men, through the whole course of ages, must be regarded as one man, always living and incessantly learning.

The First Object of the renascent Theosophical Movement of this time anticipated and reinforces this lesson in its varied intellectual, racial, and social applications. No man can break the links of brotherhood; nor is he able to isolate himself from his heritage of the past

or his obligations in the present or to the future. Hence the message: "Desire to sow no seed for your own harvesting; desire only to sow that seed the fruit of which shall feed the world."

Nature and Artifice

Not only has man "lost touch" with ancient wisdom—largely because of his obsession by the one-life theory. He has also to a great extent lost his ethical relationship with Nature. The classical "Atomists" were philosophical Pantheists. "How can a philosopher," asked H. P. Blavatsky, "regard Deity as infinite, omnipresent, and eternal, unless Nature is an aspect of IT, and IT informs every atom in Nature?" One of the karmic effects of abandoning a philosophical and logical Pantheism is to be seen in these days in the disastrous experiments of "rationalistic" science to substitute artifice for nature. This is one of our most dangerous modern perversions. In his autobiography *But To What Purpose* (London, 1946), Mr. E. L. Grant Watson, a zoologist and anthropologist who is also a practical farmer in Devonshire, has entered his protest against some forms of spoliation in this field. The administration of spices, having lights burning all night to keep hens awake, and the battery production of eggs, all lead to an inordinate death-roll among hens and chicks. In the long run, as Mr. Grant Watson tells us, Nature shows she is one too much for "up-to-date" methods founded only on scientific empiricism and economic calculations, and losses are enormous under these "improved" schemes.

Artificial Insemination

A further instance of the lack of reverence for life that inevitably follows the modern divorce of man from nature may be mentioned. The arguments recommending the artificial insemination of cattle are specious but illusory. Apart from everything else, the methods used are vicious as being destructive of a critical moment in the biological cycle. "May we not," asks Mr. Watson, "be doing an unknown harm to our cattle, a harm which may *not at once* declare itself, and are we not, from the human side, degrading those who must assist at this practice?" Another method even more unnatural is the insertion of a tabloid containing certain drugs into the neck of a virgin heifer

in the neighbourhood of the thyroid gland, causing the heifer to produce milk without either impregnation or calf-bearing. Some of the karmic consequences are obvious already, but the warnings go unheeded: "True, the heifer gives milk, but the milk when given to children produces in those children a precocious sexuality," Mr. Watson observes, and who can compute the evil results of the inevitable extension of this practice of artificial insemination to human beings?

SCIENCE AND SORCERY

In many ways Humanity is engaged, with the help of materialistic science and its coadjutor, modern sorcery, in devouring its own and Nature's children. For its liberation from these bonds of matter it must return, in all its pursuits, to the principles of the Ancient Teaching:

> That light which burns inside thee, dost thou feel it different in anywise from the light that shines in thy Brother-men?
>
> It is in no way different, though the prisoner is held in bondage by Karma, and though its outer garments delude the ignorant into saying, "Thy Soul and My Soul." *(Occult Catechism.)*

And so also with man's relationship to Nature. He must return to the true philosophy and science of antiquity:

> The radical unity of the ultimate essence of each constituent part of compounds in Nature—from Star to mineral Atom, from the highest Dhyan Chohan to the smallest infusoria, in the fullest acceptation of the term, and whether applied to the spiritual, intellectual, or physical worlds—is the one fundamental law in Occult Science. (*S.D.* I, 120.)

SUPERSONICS AND MATTER

Some observations in the April Lookout on modern uses of sound technique receive added confirmation by Sir Edward Appleton, secretary of the British Government Department of Scientific and Industrial Research. Speaking in London, this eminent scientist referred to the use of supersonic vibrations in laundries (London *Times*, May 2). He said that the practical problems of removing dirt from fabrics presented a fascinating challenge to the physicist and chemist:

> It had now been proved that dirt—matter in the wrong place—was often held to material by electrical forces. Most soiling materials

> were negatively charged electrically, and electric forces, at any rate in part, were responsible for the adhesion of dirt to fabrics.

The speaker went on to say that, in the cleaning of textiles, this electrical union between molecules had first to be disrupted. So far, detergents had been furnished for this purpose; but good progress had now been made in physical investigation of the use of intense high-frequency sound vibrations. "The function of these supersonic vibrations was to shake out the dirt particles when the electrical bonds had been broken."

A Ladder of Forces

In such investigations may be seen further evidence of the continuing justification of Occultism by Science. In the theory and practice of high-frequency sound vibrations, the once fabled progeny of *Fohat* begin to come into their own! The constructive force of cosmic electricity, known under this Tibetan name, has seven "co-operative and active progeny," which are, among other energies, Electricity, Magnetism, Sound, Light, Heat, Cohesion, etc. Only the purely phenomenal effects of the seven primary forces of cosmic electricity are cognizable on the terrestrial plane. In all these forces Occultism sees—

> a ladder, the lower rungs of which belong to *exoteric* physics, and the higher are traced to a living, intelligent, invisible Power which is, as a rule, the unconcerned, and exceptionally the conscious, cause of the sense-born phenomenon designated as this or another natural law. (*S.D.* II, 554.)

The Moral Antidote

The notable success of "Alcoholics Anonymous" in helping men and women to reclaim themselves from the habit of drink is a phenomenon which receives various explanations. Some A.A. members have described it as a religious experience, bringing them a new faith in "God," and enabling them to reform. Possibly they have no other terms to convey the sense of power awakened within them, no other symbol for their renewed faith in themselves. The "whole story," perhaps, is different in each case, but a powerful psychological factor is one of the constants: the alcoholic is treated without condemnation or self-righteousness because a fellow alcoholic is his

"sponsor." The regimen is strict and straightforward; the A.A. member is not given to equivocation, nor is he deceived by any dodge.

THE FIRST STEP

A recent article in *This Week* Magazine (May 18) gives one man's experience with the method. His first contact was with two men, strangers, who came to talk to him at Bellevue: "Those two knew their stuff. They knew everything I had to say because they'd been through the wringer themselves." He was told about A.A., and promised to attend a meeting. After a few meetings he caught the idea—

> For the first time in my life I discovered what was wrong with me. I used to be told that I was spineless, gutless, an immoral swine, that I'd end up in a lunatic asylum. But in those five years nobody, nobody at all, sat down with me and told me that I was sick, physically allergic to alcohol, that I suffered from an incurable, progressive disease. Away in the beginning, I thought it was a question of learning how to control my drinking, when to stop. But the speaker told the truth: A drink is a drink. One is too much; a hundred is not enough. If you're an alcoholic, the answer is no alcohol. None at all. Nothing.
>
> Up to this time, to use an A.A. expression, I just wanted to want to quit. Now I wanted to quit, period. After the meeting, I went over to the speaker and asked him for advice. He agreed to be my sponsor, and he worked with me for months. . . .

THE FEELING OF SECURITY

> After six months, I was asked to speak at one of the meetings. Afterward, a newcomer came over to ask me for advice. Me. I thought I'd never be able to repay my sponsor. Now I knew the way. The A.A. way. I worked on that guy, I'll tell you. I felt as though my own life and my own ability to remain dry depended on my success with him. And I've worked on a good many others since.

The psychological explanation given of A.A. is:

> The alcoholic is an outcast, always trying to come back to the group, society. But the group says, "We don't want you. You've failed." In A.A. he has other people like himself. They know him, want to help him, but . . . they have high standards.

> Now when a man identifies himself with any group he wants to be like them; their standards become his. Once A.A. standards are adopted they do result in sobriety—but that isn't enough. By recruiting more members, a man builds up the power of the thing he believes in, thus reinforcing his own faith. I never feel more secure than when I'm working on a new A.A.

The Alchemy of Altruism

It might seem far-fetched to say that the doctrine of the seven principles is necessary to a complete cure of a psychic excess of this kind, but this alcoholic's first release came when he could view his habit as an illness, and not as "himself." His story concludes, "I've lost the desire for drinking; I've never lost the regret that I can't drink"—which means that he *hasn't* lost the desire to drink. But he realizes that *he* is not the desire, and having established his identity as something greater than his alcoholism, he can hold "his own."

Especially is he reformed through the alchemy of altruism, for no personal habit, regret or difficulty can be nourished by inattention, and the desire to help others strengthens the will and weakens all lesser desires. The security thus achieved is unassailable, because it is not personal.

"—Or After Many Days"

Since Theosophy "throws the word coincidence out of its vocabulary," there is no simple formula for explaining the death of S. W. McClendon, who was killed by a flying sliver of wood no bigger than a man's finger:

> McClendon had gone to the Sterling Lumber company mill at the town of Oakley near Martinez this morning to buy some lumber for the new house he was building.
>
> He was standing idly by watching some workmen sawing lumber when he fell to the ground.
>
> He was rushed to the Oakley hospital and pronounced dead on arrival—with a splinter, thrown off by the saw, lodged in his heart. (Pasadena *Independent,* May 2.)

"He who knows what is the ultimate division of time in this Universe" would be able to trace the exquisite precision of a law which moves a stray splinter to become a karmic agent. "For all other men,"

as an aphorism on karma states, "Karma is in its essential nature unknown and unknowable." What specialized magnetism of the moral law drew man and elemental lives together in such an extraordinary circumstance? Theosophy teaches that the law involved is inherent in the permanent individuality of the man himself. Atma, the seventh principle in man, "is the highest aspect of Karma, *its working agent* of ITSELF in one aspect," writes H. P. Blavatsky (*Key,* 135). Or, as the Gnostics taught, this highest principle is "*Moira, Fate* (Karmic Ego), whose business it is to lead the man to the end appointed for him; if he hath to die by the fire, to lead him into the fire, if he hath to die by a wild beast, to lead him unto the wild beast, etc."

THERMAL SIGHT

John J. O'Neill, science editor of the New York *Herald-Tribune,* brings together several studies of body radiation, and provides some speculations on how human beings would look if they could be seen by their own radiation. In the first place—

> The color of all men would be black in terms of our present temperature notation. All human skins radiate an almost perfect "black-body radiator." The perfect black body, as defined by the physicist, would be one which changes its radiation uniformly with changes in temperature so that its color becomes an index of its temperature.
>
> Dr. J. D. Hardy, of the Russell Sage Institute of Pathology, who has made extensive studies of body temperatures and their internal control, in investigating skin temperature found the human skin within 1 per cent of being a perfect black-body radiator. . . .

If we could see in the range of heat rays, however, we would not be seeing the human skin as black but in colors of some kind. That is, we would if nature provided a new kind of eye—insulated thermally from the rest of the body. "This would probably be accomplished," according to Mr. O'Neill, "by tapering off the sensitivity of the eye to the higher temperatures just as our present eyes are tapered off in their sensitivity to the hotter ultra-violet radiations."

"HOT-HEADS"

The description of the human being as seen by its radiations is deduced from data presented by Dr. Charles Sheard, professor of biophysics, University of Minnesota, in *Medical Physics.*

We would appear [Mr. O'Neill writes] as hot-heads because our foreheads emit the greatest amount of radiation. The neck and face would be only slightly less bright. If the brightness of the forehead is taken as 100, that of the neck and face would be 90 and 87. The next brightest part of the body would be the inner surface of the thigh, with a rating of 83. The abdomen and back would be about equally bright, 76, and the chest slightly less, 71. The mammary glands of the female are slightly less bright, 65. The palm of the hand and the outer surface of the thigh are of about the same brightness, 64 and 62.

The least amount of radiation is given out by the back of the hand, 22. Next lowest is the sole of the foot, 29; then the forearm, 30; then the upper arm, outer surface, 31, and the back of the foot, 34. The inner surface of the upper arm and the lower leg are 49.

"A Colorful Individual"

Although we cannot guess what color sensations would be like in this low-temperature range, it is possible to speculate on the basis of these radiation index figures, taking them as points on a color scale, with 100 correlated with the violet end of the visible spectrum and 0 as the red end.

With such a comparison, then, the average human being would be seen with a violet forehead, a purple neck, a blue face, a greenish-blue inner thigh, green back, green abdomen, a yellowish-green chest, yellow outer thighs and lower legs, yellowish-orange inner upper arm. The forearm would be orange and so would the hair. The back of the foot would be orange, and the sole reddish-orange. The back of the hand would be a deep maroon while the more radiant palm would be green.

"A New Level of Frankness"

All physical activities would change the color distribution, but emotional experiences would transform the color pattern even more radically:

The unpleasant kind that make us want to crawl into a rat hole would probably shift all colors toward the lower or red end while a pleasant paroxysm would probably cause us to burst out in a blue or purple glow all over. An untruth uttered might cause sufficient nerve tension to change the color of the face. Changes in emotional

states would undoubtedly be plainly revealed by shifts in tint or hue and it would be necessary to put all of our social relationships on a new level of frankness and candor.

MECHANICAL EVOLUTION

Mr. O'Neill is not of the opinion that the human race has "evolve to a sufficiently high plane to be able to tolerate conditions in whic we would actually see ourselves in our natural colors." The necessit for such evolution is, however, made a trifle more immediate by D Donald H. Andrews, professor of chemistry, Johns Hopkins Un versity, who has discovered—

> that the radiations from the human body can be picked up directly on an extremely simple detector, a thin strip of metal, and transmitted on a television circuit. . . . [Dr. Andrews] stood in an absolutely dark room and had the columbium nitride detector scan him as he stood with outstretched arms before the pickup apparatus. He saw himself reproduced on the screen as an almost ghostlike apparition as if he were illuminated by white light.
>
> With such sensitive detectors being developed and color television already here, perhaps the colorful "hot-headed" individual may be a routine reality tomorrow instead of a fantastic dream. (New York *Herald Tribune,* May 18.)

"Heat-vision," as it may be called, is another mechanical analog for the hidden powers in man. Radio specializes some of the feature of clairaudience; x-rays are a minor form of psychometry; and tele vision is physical clairvoyance. Matter has been permeated by instru ments, as in a future cycle it will be permeated by the mind of man (The identification of psychic states by means of correlations o color is illustrated in *Transactions,* p. 71.) The most fantastic inger uities of modern science can thus have direct human interest, if the do no more than advertise the tenuous illusions of matter, time an space and suggest that the only reality of any maya is the soul' power over it.